HOME 81% 6:10 PM

Correspondence reporting as attached under exigent circumstances.

Add label

Queued 6:10 PM

to cleveland.cv

From James E. Horton • jaakovos@gmail.com

To cleveland.cv@ic.fbi.gov

Date Mar 7, 2020, 6:10 PM

To whom this may concern (Intake):

Please excuse me if this correspondence (at first) seems inappropriate. I am aware you do not display email address on your current, public webpages. Today, while planning to correspond, with this same purpose, via the Electronic Tip Form, I discovered your email address per accident. Urgently, I have need

address per accident. Urgently, I have need situationally to communicate directly. (My information below should explain.) This means is the best solution. Therefore, please give it conscientious attention under the following circumstances:

I reasonably suspect mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. PLEASE BE ADVISED: The mailing sent 03052020... may VERY POSSIBLY BE TAMPERED and, precariously, MISREPRESENTATIVE of my INTENT maliciously in conspiracy to commit false prosecution retaliatory (as further RICO VIOLATIONS) and FOUL PLAY.

I most certainly know I am being targeted by an organized crime conspiracy with a proven motive. (Please see attachment for relevant information.)

For quite some time, I have been attempting to report some of its joindered crimes by its network of colluders. Unfortunately, per my experiences, it also continually involves mail fraud, tampering and theft. It also involves extreme abuses of electronic surveillance with intent to obstruct justice and my fundamental rights to address.

On 03052020, I reattempted with an additional complaint of reasonably suspected mail fraud involving letter to your field office. I have also mailed a complaint to the Inspector

have also mailed a complaint to the Inspector General of USPS by UPS at a UPS Store.

I reasonably suspect fraudulent mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. (Please see attachment for information.) The clerk charged me $20.38 at the same UPS Store location. He claimed the exorbitant price for requested "Signature Required" service. The receipt did not account for any itemization of the charges. It was vague. It only recorded "ground commercial" service. Also, the clerk took my envelope, just after I prepared it, without adequate sealing (I thought it would be common-sense to complete while applying postage.)

Since, at same location, I received a report of confirmation of the previous delivery to the postmaster in VA, I non-paranoidally decided to trust him. Furthermore, I am under extreme overburden by a multitude of procedural and other harassments and commotions -- too many to meticule over every accumulative detail.

After leaving, I researched further about UPS terms. I realized reasonable suspicions concerning this transaction. I am too overburdened by time-constraint to explain them; I am confident that my attached information will corroborate to justify my reasonably cautious and relevant suspicion.

Wherefore, please receive the attached

Wherefore, please receive the attached digital copy of my actual mailing. Furthermore, I just requested redirection of the delivery back to the sending business to retrieve it without the possible harm of falsified tampering or interception by pernicious enemies to my lawful actions. Management communicated promise to effect my request on the next business day of Monday, since today is Saturday and shipping offices are closed. He claimed incapacity to document transaction of this request until contacting to process it. I did, however, audio record the conversation being party myself. Please, also, maintain attention to its possible delivery expected to be by Friday (03142020) with memory of my preemptive information. In the event that the delivery arrives by UPS inconsistent with the attachment hereto, it was criminally tampered during delivery.

Thank you,
James E. Horton (Birthname on record)

200305Cr...2020.pdf

Correspondence reporting as attached under exigent circumstances.

Add label

Queued 6:34 PM
to cleveland.cv

To whom this may concern (Intake):

Please excuse me if this correspondence (at first) seems inappropriate. I am aware you do not display email address on your current, public webpages. Today, while planning to correspond, with this same purpose, via the Electronic Tip Form, I discovered your email address per accident. Urgently, I have need situationally to communicate directly. (My information below should explain.) This means is the best solution. Therefore, please give it conscientious attention under the following circumstances:

I reasonably suspect mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. PLEASE BE ADVISED: The mailing sent

PLEASE BE ADVISED: The mailing sent 03052020... may VERY POSSIBLY BE TAMPERED and, precariously, MISREPRESENTATIVE of my INTENT maliciously in conspiracy to commit false prosecution retaliatory (as further RICO VIOLATIONS) and FOUL PLAY.

I most certainly know I am being targeted by an organized crime conspiracy with a proven motive. (Please see attachment for relevant information.)

For quite some time, I have been attempting to report some of its joindered crimes by its network of colluders. Unfortunately, per my experiences, it also continually involves mail fraud, tampering and theft. It also involves extreme abuses of electronic surveillance with intent to obstruct justice and my fundamental rights to address.

On 03052020, I reattempted with an additional complaint of reasonably suspected mail fraud involving letter to your field office. I have also mailed a complaint to the Inspector General of USPS by UPS at a UPS Store.

I reasonably suspect fraudulent mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. (Please see attachment for information.) The clerk charged me $20.38 at the same UPS Store location. He claimed the exorbitant price for requested "Signature

exorbitant price for requested "Signature Required" service. The receipt did not account for any itemization of the charges. It was vague. It only recorded "ground commercial" service. Also, the clerk took my envelope, just after I prepared it, without adequate sealing (I thought it would be common-sense to complete while applying postage.)

Since, at same location, I received a report of confirmation of the previous delivery to the postmaster in VA, I non-paranoidally decided to trust him. Furthermore, I am under extreme overburden by a multitude of procedural and other harassments and commotions -- too many to meticule over every accumulative detail.

After leaving, I researched further about UPS terms. I realized reasonable suspicions concerning this transaction. I am too overburdened by time-constraint to explain them; I am confident that my attached information will corroborate to justify my reasonably cautious and relevant suspicion.

Wherefore, please receive the attached digital copy of my actual mailing. Furthermore, I just requested redirection of the delivery back to the sending business to retrieve it without the possible harm of falsified tampering or interception by pernicious enemies to my lawful actions. Management communicated promise to effect my request on the next

promise to effect my request on the next business day of Monday, since today is Saturday and shipping offices are closed. He claimed incapacity to document transaction of this request until contacting to process it. I did, however, audio record the conversation being party myself. Please, also, maintain attention to its possible delivery expected to be by Friday (03142020) with memory of my preemptive information. In the event that the delivery arrives by UPS inconsistent with the attachment hereto, it was criminally tampered during delivery.

Thank you,
James E. Horton (Birthname on record)

200305Cr...2020.pdf

HOME 62% 7:56 PM

Correspondence reporting as attached under exigent circumstances.

Add label

James E. Ho... 7:54 PM

to cleveland.cv

From James E. Horton • jaakovos@gmail.com

To cleveland.cv@ic.fbi.gov

Date Mar 7, 2020, 7:54 PM

View security details

To whom this may concern (Intake):

Please excuse me if this correspondence (at first) seems inappropriate. I am aware you do not display email address on your current, public webpages. Today, while planning to correspond, with this same purpose, via the Electronic Tip Form, I discovered your email

Electronic Tip Form, I discovered your email address per accident. Urgently, I have need situationally to communicate directly. (My information below should explain.) This means is the best solution. Therefore, please give it conscientious attention under the following circumstances:

I reasonably suspect mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. PLEASE BE ADVISED: The mailing sent 03052020... may VERY POSSIBLY BE TAMPERED and, precariously, MISREPRESENTATIVE of my INTENT maliciously in conspiracy to commit false prosecution retaliatory (as further RICO VIOLATIONS) and FOUL PLAY.

I most certainly know I am being targeted by an organized crime conspiracy with a proven motive. (Please see attachment for relevant information.)

For quite some time, I have been attempting to report some of its joindered crimes by its network of colluders. Unfortunately, per my experiences, it also continually involves mail fraud, tampering and theft. It also involves extreme abuses of electronic surveillance with intent to obstruct justice and my fundamental rights to address.

On 03052020, I reattempted with an additional complaint of reasonably suspected

On 03052020, I reattempted with an additional complaint of reasonably suspected mail fraud involving letter to your field office. I have also mailed a complaint to the Inspector General of USPS by UPS at a UPS Store.

I reasonably suspect fraudulent mail tampering of a letter of information mailed to your field office. (Please see attachment for information.) The clerk charged me $20.38 at the same UPS Store location. He claimed the exorbitant price for requested "Signature Required" service. The receipt did not account for any itemization of the charges. It was vague. It only recorded "ground commercial" service. Also, the clerk took my envelope, just after I prepared it, without adequate sealing (I thought it would be common-sense to complete while applying postage.)

Since, at same location, I received a report of confirmation of the previous delivery to the postmaster in VA, I non-paranoidally decided to trust him. Furthermore, I am under extreme overburden by a multitude of procedural and other harassments and commotions -- too many to meticule over every accumulative detail.

After leaving, I researched further about UPS terms. I realized reasonable suspicions concerning this transaction. I am too overburdened by time-constraint to explain them; I am confident that my attached

overburdened by time-constraint to explain them; I am confident that my attached information will corroborate to justify my reasonably cautious and relevant suspicion.

Wherefore, please receive the attached digital copy of my actual mailing. Furthermore, I just requested redirection of the delivery back to the sending business to retrieve it without the possible harm of falsified tampering or interception by pernicious enemies to my lawful actions. Management communicated promise to effect my request on the next business day of Monday, since today is Saturday and shipping offices are closed. He claimed incapacity to document transaction of this request until contacting to process it. I did, however, audio record the conversation being party myself. Please, also, maintain attention to its possible delivery expected to be by Friday (03142020) with memory of my preemptive information. In the event that the delivery arrives by UPS inconsistent with the attachment hereto, it was criminally tampered during delivery.

Thank you,
James E. Horton (Birthname on record)

the possible harm of falsified tampering or interception by pernicious enemies to my lawful actions. Management communicated promise to effect my request on the next business day of Monday, since today is Saturday and shipping offices are closed. He claimed incapacity to document transaction of this request until contacting to process it. I did, however, audio record the conversation being party myself. Please, also, maintain attention to its possible delivery expected to be by Friday (03142020) with memory of my preemptive information. In the event that the delivery arrives by UPS inconsistent with the attachment hereto, it was criminally tampered during delivery.

Thank you,
James E. Horton (Birthname on record)

200305Cr...2020.pdf

1



James E. Hooton
Will Subpoena
Email Address: jeh[illegible]@gmail.com

Federal Bureau of Investigation
1501 Lakeside Ave
Cleveland OH 44114

To whom this may concern,

On [illegible] 2020, I reported portions of the attached information via the FBI's online tip form. I selected "Ohio" for region. Limitations of content precluded report as thoroughly intended. Therefore, I am, hereby, corresponding to report full intent in letter by mail.

P.S. I am, hereby, attempting to send information regarding the following:

On 0112 hrs, I attempted making a payment on at a post office service located inside, and attached to a grocery store at: [illegible], [illegible] Avenue, Sacramento, CA 95815. I paid for [illegible] of mail. Staff [illegible] refused to interfere with this post office mail theft and tampering.

The female customer service employee instructed customers attempts to prevent their postal service to unlawfully personally delay transaction. (I have experienced similar, harassing conversations by the multiple "phone" called my cell management for this customer, personal attention. She had discussed my prosecution of the robbery with [illegible] during [illegible].) During the conversation, distracting, the caller fell indirect to the Cleveland FBI Field Office. The call conversation was by [illegible] the client, in some conversation reported to person prior, phone. Just prior, immediately upon my arrival to the counter line, with a long line, and thirty-five minutes before close, she was called to an abnormal and inappropriately - to meet/speak for a discussion, meet/sign in a private office (which denied with time delay and conflict).

Since reasonably suspicious of a conspiracy to commit mail fraud and theft, I also reported via the U.S. Internal Revenue Service, specifically Hamilton. I do, however, intend to correspond directly to the Cleveland FBI Office. Furthermore, I left a message relaying said suspicions by phone at (216)522-1400 per attendant on the call station. I requested to record my message.

Date:

Thank You,

James E. Hooton
James E Hooton

INFORMATION

I am, hereby, reporting crimes: Criminal Record Tampering, destroying evidence, Conspiracy to Commit Unconstitutional Infractions, various heinous crimes of Racketeering (RICO Violations) and all types of Fraudulent. I am certain that same acts are retaliatory malicious toward the innocent, potential witness

INFORMATION

I am, hereby, reporting crimes: Criminal Record Tampering, destroying evidence, Conspiracy to Commit Unconstitutional Infractions, various heinous or Racketeering (RICO Violations) and all types of Foulplay. I am certain that same acts are retaliatory malicious toward this innocent, potential witness.

I do not have time (overburdened) to prepare original averments, documentary citations should be self-explanatory.

Email Correspondence with Stark County Court of Common Pleas Clerk

From: Farna Pileggi

fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov

To: Me

Date 12/31/19 11:45 PM

I spoke with my supervisor. We don't usually make a copy of the sheet with someone's name on it. I did photo-copy it and enclose it for you.

Farna Pileggi

Deputy Clerk

(330) 451-7796

From: Me

To fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov

Date 01/01/2020 8:34 PM

Thank you for your response. I appreciate the query report of case numbers associated with same name as mine. It was helpful toward my objective.

Since "Personal papers and effects have been illegally seized and stolen (by conspirators colluding in misconduct)," I need to identify specific case pertinent for recovery of my personal records. Could you please inform, by reply, of which cases (of either 2001JCV116343, 2001JCR120041, 2003DR00063 or 2003JG011286) also mention one Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver as party? Thank you.

From: Farna Pileggi

fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov

To: Me

Date 01/02/2020 7:23 AM

Mr. Horton

This department only applies to the DR and JCV cases. DR cases are public record and your case (2003DR00063) does not refer to Marie Brosky or Marie Beaver. As to the JCV case (2001JCV116343), it is not public record so I cannot give you any information. If you are in town, please come in with your picture ID and we will give you any info you want. If you are out of town, please make a copy of your driver's license and have it notarized and send it to us with your request.

As to the other cases:

2001JCR120041 ◆ Call the Juvenile Criminal Department at (330) 451-7797

2003JG011286 ◆ Call the Civil Department at (330) 451-7796

From: Me

To fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov

Date 01/06/2020 7:25 PM

I am certain, living my life, that there was a DR case pending 1999 through 2004 approximately! Marie Brosky was party. During, her name changed to Beaver. It involved custody of one Tia Horton. The others are her juvenile delinquency cases while in custody of the former, and an African-American foster family who harassed me for non-entitled child-support. What is the number of this custody case requested? Also, please provide, by reply, summary information of 2007030022.

If the case described with my request does not exist, there conspicuously has been criminal record tampering and destruction. I do have proof of organized crime involve. It has been a recurring problem in my matters from these organized criminals colluding with infiltrated.

What is this number. What is 2007030022, a separate case about? I expect obligatory answer!

From: Cathy Allen

CMAllen@starkcountyohio.gov

To: Me

Date 01/06/2020 7:51 AM

Any questions regarding this case please contact Stark County Family Court (2007030022) ◆ Any further questions you can contact me at 330-451-7782. Thank you- Cathy

From: Farna Pileggi

Sent: Thursday, January 02, 2020 10:41 AM

To: Cathy Allen

Subject: FW: Searching James E. Horton

Cathy

Please read all of the emails. He sent the latest one and I don't know what to answer. Thank you. Farna

On Thu, Jan 2, 2020, 7:23 AM Farna Pileggi <fpileggi@starkcountyohio.gov> wrote:

(Pileggi sent, by reply, above emails to Cathy Allen.)

From: Me

To: CMAllen@starkcountyohio.gov

Date 01/06/2020 9:59 PM

Hello,

I have been redirected with my inquiries. For clarity, do you work for the Stark County Court of Common Pleas? A search of its website was without results. If so, what job description do you have?

In my situation communications need to be by email. I am extremely time-consumed by various malicious, procedural harassments and obstructions. It is not practicable to attempt phone calls. Email is available for efficient, convenient correspondence in matters.

From: Cathy Allen

CMAllen@starkcountyohio.gov

To: Me

Date 01/06/2020 6:08 AM

Yes, I work for Stark County Clerk of Courts, family court division. (Concluded)

Below is content of a Petition for Writ of Mandate presented by District Court of California. Subsequently, the Supreme Court (procedurally initially) on challenging Petition for Writ of Review denying its delivery. I have similar tracking proof that it was delivered.

By my experiences, I have reason to know that some of these involved conspirators are members of an "Attorney Unit" criminally colluding with all public official parties covering themselves on these matters intended. This anomalous "Attorney Unit" is mentioned within

Content cited from said petitions:

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT Superior Court No. 13-3628, 13-2365, 14-1219 & 12-1910 Court of Appeal No. PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND MOTION TO JUDGE BY CAUSE OF ORDINARY PRELIEF TO PRESIDING JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF YOLO THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT

WHEREFORE, Petitioner, James E. Horton, moving this Court to 1. immediately stay all proceedings pending primary case issue case 13-3628 until further orders of this Court of Appeal; 2. issue peremptory writ of mandate commanding Respondent Court to return to Petitioner his fundamental rights to Speedy Trial and Due Process.

Cases 3. Consolidation commanding the cases caused by Extraordinary Remedy together with primary case (Case No. 13-3628) and 14. Consolidation commanding Respondent Court to dismiss all three respective charges (13-3628, 13-2365, and 14-1219).

12. Hereafter, Petitioner requests the Court to take Judicial Notice of Petitioner's Motion & Declaration and Affidavit in Support of Motion to Dismiss and Affidavit of Petitioner's Fundamental Rights Violations and Anomalous Procedures Leading to Unjustifiable Delay.

STATEMENT OF FACTS: Three years and seven months ago, prosecutorial action (still pending) was initiated against Petitioner, James E. Horton, Public Officials, together have committed the following actions (both in court and out-of-court colluding):

* The first case (case 13-3628) amongst Malicious series of Prosecutorial Harassments initiated 06/04/2013 charging violation of Resisting Arrest, brought Battery post arraignment. Public Defender (Ron Howard) overzealously and inexplicably raised Unreasonable and Malicious Doubt of Petitioner's COMPETENCE TO STAND TRIAL during open pretrial conference. Howard based Doubt raised solely on police report without adequate consultation due per Fiduciary Duty, respective to an Attorney's Oath. Furthermore, during same hearing, Public Defender requested to "Fast Track" said case as he verbalized according as to some procedure invented as termed (at least at current time). Procedure (anomalous and arbitrary) was granted upon his request. It prejudiced fundamental Due Process Rights prima facie, therefore, in response, Petitioner filed a Faretta motion raising issue of Substantial Conflict irreconcilable due to incompetent and ineffective Counsel by the Public Defenders' Office. Court granted, upon second Faretta motion, Waiver of Counsel and Self Representation on 02/04/2014. Since Waiver of Counsel, Petitioner filed pretrial motions (timely and proper with full merit) defending that prosecution lacked probable cause upon a pretextual, malicious, false arrest. These were prejudicially denied. Court maliciously continued pursuing wrongful prosecution. Petitioner continued challenging prejudicial errors and denials per case is still pending.

* Subsequent to this first arraignment, an overburdening series of actions began. Four additional, frivolous charges initiated. At respective arraignments, Counsel was appointed for three of them (Cases 13-2365, 14-1219 and 14-4487).

* During pendencies, appointed counsel orally motioned for another anomalous procedure for all three subsequent cases together which Judge Daniel Maguire agreed to and ordered. Said to be "Trailing," but not pondered, all cases versus Petitioner were made to be scheduled consecutively and concurrently on the docket. As a result, all hearings were scheduled for all cases simultaneously.

Scheduled hearings, actually, were discriminatorily truncated with disinformed effect. Throughout, Maguire continually prejudiced Petitioner's time for Due Process procedure to be heard on matters for even first case while others were postponed and said to be "trailing" as aforementioned. Ironically, abusing discretion, he rationalized claiming "interest of the time of the court" with an "overburdened docket." Contrarily, Petitioner continually argued court Malicious discriminated against him when considering same basis.

* Subsequent case 13-2365 also initiated by the West Sacramento Police Department upon first contact on 10/07/2013. Petitioner, on date, was charged with Illegal Scavenging for taking one bottle from a garbage can. On 09/08/2014, Petitioner appeared in Department 7 (at old court house in Woodland) of Criminal Court before Judge Maguire for hearing upon Motion to Dismiss in first case (13-3628). Suddenly, in open court, judge opened proceeding by presenting unexpected Petitioner with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket. Judge called Public Defender, Karen Scott (present for other cases on same day's docket), to the bench since appointed at pretrial conference in case numbered 13-2365 on 04/08/2014. Per incompetent, arbitrary request of said public defender, Respondent court grossly abused discretion granting invented procedure that Due Process for said case "trail" case 13-3628. Thereby, in effect, Due Process on subsequent case was postponed until completion of first case. Otherwise, court treated case as if pondered in error within minutes recorded, and on seconds, for each case. Counsel's request was without consent of Petitioner and without consultation. Consequently, procedure on it has thus far been totally neglected, then "approved" procrastinated on by public officials. Meanwhile, minutes for each proceeding are recorded severally for all case dockets simultaneously as scheduled concurrently (as if pondered without relevant nexus) and with inadequate time for one hearing procedure imposed. It gives procedure anomaly unjustifiable.

* Case 14-1219 involves charge of a camping infraction. Facts of incident upon which citation was based include: 1) Circumstantially, he was under an overhang to escape rain (on said date) with unprotected case files and work product on his person. He informed the Officer of these circumstances, facts during an investigatory stop. Still, the officer, irrespective of Totality of Circumstances, cited. Previously,

This case also was transferred in error to Department 7 of Criminal Court by anomalous procedure. Actually, (by malicious incompetency) two arraignments were set. As reflected by Minutes within Case summary report, an arraignment as scheduled aforesaid in Traffic Court for 03/06/2014 was rescheduled (recorded in minutes to be "vacated?") as parte and out-of-court, to earlier date of 02/04/2014 in Criminal Court, Department 7 (at old court house in Woodland) and "designed" to Judge Maguire. Petitioner appeared on same date as scheduled for Trial Setting Conference in first case 13-3628. He was suddenly presented unexpectedly with the addition of this case to the Criminal Court docket two days prior to its actual, original arraignment in Traffic Court. Petitioner was then spontaneously arraigned. He pled Not Guilty. Public Defender was appointed. At Pre-Trial Conference on 04/08/2014, per request of Public Defender (particular arm), said case was scheduled to dockets of "trailing" cases as aforementioned (contrary to Petitioner's stated desires for deferred). Case is still pending. "trailing" was requested.

* Anomalous procedures motioned for aforesaid grossly prejudiced Petitioner prima facie. By such gross abuses of discretion, Due Process has been grossly denied. Petitioner expressed contrary desires during very few inadequate consultations with counsel. Furthermore, although cases numerous were severally vacated (postponed) as "trailing," still records (Minute Sheets and Case Summary Reports) falsely reflect "Matter heard" for hearings in each severally. Thereby, cases have compounded together to Overburden simultaneously. Above also constitutes extreme Abuse of Legal Process violating continued to severally Due and Fair Trial Rights. Repeatedly (both to counsel in meeting and in open court), he has raised discrepancy about these acts of Procedure Irregularity and Harassment. Continually, he has been prejudicially ignored on issue. Court has responded only incrementally more and more Malicious and Tortuously.

* During pendencies, Court obligated Petitioner to attend total of 40 pretrial hearings and 3 days in 1 date for which numerous hearings and judgements are delayed. The trial is not concluded. Hearings have resulted in a long train of blatant prejudicial denials flying in the face of Constitutional Rights.

* Since commencements, Petitioner successfully raised issues of substantial conflict due to ineffective counsel. Completely adverse to adequate defense violating attorney-client privilege and Attorney's Oath) and right to waive counsel. Therefore, court granted right to self representation in all cases during hearing on 10/07/2015 upon reasoning above herein. Based for competent counsel, necessitated assertion of right. Petitioner is less trained.

* A case: 14-4491 initiated by Woodland Police Department alleging violation of PC ? 415(1). Facts are that a Corporal baited Petitioner by blocking an Entrance to Police Station retaliating against his intent to acquire a citizen?s complaint form concerning prior misconduct. Said case was dismissed upon motion to dismiss (of Petitioner, Pro Se) and for lack of sufficient evidence on 01/7/2016. As a result, Petitioner cause for civil action.
* Numerous times, in various ways, within pretrial motions to dismiss with merit, Petitioner has raised point headed as follows: DEFENDANT?S RIGHT TO FAIR TRIAL PREJUDICED BY PROTRACTED RESTRAINT OF HIS LIBERTY TO AN AREA.
* Present case primarily at issue (15-4705) initiated with a Malicious Arrest on 02/16/2015 in Woodland, CA made solely on information unconstitutionally during accuser?s dispatch call ? a false, malicious report. Arrest was made away from scene of incident. Original complaint alleged violations of two charges 647.6(A), Annoy/Molest Child, and PC ? 415(1), Fight/Challenge Fight. Arraignment was scheduled on 05/14/2015 at Respondent Superior Court.
Prior to arraignment aforementioned, Prosecution rejected said case for "lack of sufficient evidence ? (On date Petitioner arrived, court was still open to b[illegible] Inquiring at clerk of court and the D.A. Office, he learned of rejection by a hand-delivered letter. Letter was addressed to "Indigent? without mailing address [illegible] on sealed motions.) On 12/07/2015, however, at trial readiness for first case 13-3628, Judge Maguire opened hearing informing of a new and ill prosecution charge [illegible] violation of PC ? 415(1) with 647.6 dropped for lack of sufficient evidence. The Court immediately expedited this new case rendulated to trial as primary emphasis on Docket. Maguire set continuances for other (prior) cases per "trailing? procedure. Conspicuously, timing of action was tactical toward Abuse of Legal Process with intent to Overburden Petitioner?s Right to Fair Trial.
* On 02/17/2016, Petitioner filed Common Law Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial, Due Process and Fair Trial in case: 15-6705 arguing: Bad-faith delay of nine and one half months, without showing of good cause, from arrest to arraignment, constituted "procrastination of public officials? denying Fundamental Rights. (Please refer to Appendix ____.) Also, on 02/19/2016 he filed Notice of Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial responsive to Prosecution?s untimely disclosure of discovery, and in open court, during jury trial date on 02/25/2016. Therein, he addressed: "Procrastination of public officials has caused (another) two months of bad faith delay? pursuant to PC ss 1382 (30-day rule)? since case needed continuance until 04/11/2016. Court prejudicially denied both motions on 03/23/2016. (Please refer to Appendix ____.)
* On 04/05/2016, Petitioner filed Petition for Writ of Mandate and Request for Stay of Proceedings? After Denial of Common Law Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial, Due Process and Fair Trial and Notice of Motion to Dismiss Because of Denial of Right to Speedy Trial Regarding Charge of Violation of CA PC 415(1) arguing points: JUDGE PREJUDICIALLY ERRED BY MALICIOUS IGNORANCE OF PETITIONER?S FULLY MERITORIOUS ARGUMENT and DEFENDANT IS PREJUDICED BY RESTRAINT OF LIBERTY TO AN AREA. As result, at trial readiness conference scheduled 04/21/2016, trial was vacated until 06/15/2016 for time in lieu of decision pending upon request for stay. (Prosecutor Fritz Van Der Hoek filed his opposition 05/05/2016? please refer to Appendix ____.) Decision upon is still pending untimely delayed by Appellate Division of Respondent Court. In full faith effort, Petitioner visited clerk multiple times seeking said decision. Court continually informed Petitioner that said Petition has been sent for scrutiny to such as called an "Attorney Unit? since 05/05/2016 being same date prosecution filed its opposition. Fail to provided concerning status raise serious suspicions about ex parte, out-of-court contact with judge.
* Actually, proceedings since 06/22/2016 constituted "Mistrial ? At continued trial readiness on 06/15/2016, Petitioner, again, requested continuance (with showing of cause and merit) in lieu of inordinate, untimely delay (by Appellate Department) of decisions upon his Petition for Writ of Mandate and Request for Stay thereon. In response, Judge Maguire: 1) vacated conference until 06/17/2016; 2) then, ordered parties to "file papers? (and by vacated date of 06/17/2016) informing Appellate Department concerning delays as above. Thereby, only less than two days were given for motion practice, per order, with disregard for statutory procedure at issue (reasonable deadlines). On 06/17/2016, prior to hearing, Petitioner (being procedurally overburdened unfairly) filed an ANSWER TO RESPONDENT?S REPLY BRIEF addressing, as order, issue of said delays. (Please refer to Appendix ____.)
At continued hearing on 06/17/2016, Judge Maguire informed of denial of stay and set jury selection to begin 06/22/2016. Court prejudicially denied his motions for mistrial. Petitioner (at least) twice orally moved for mistrial upon above facts: he motioned on same date, in open court (06/17/2016), and then during evidentiary procedure hearing (06/22/2016). Judge reasoned, in part, that he only accepts motions in writing (and during oral argument proceedings).
* Post further gross abusive abuses of discretion occurring between 06/15/2016 and 06/17/2016, trial wrongfully proceeded on 06/22/2016. Severe Due Process violations occurred during trial. Just three examples are as follows:
* During voir dire selection on 06/22/2016, Supervisor of Woodland Police Department?s Detective Unit was detected in jury box. Said presence of Officer (Agent of Party in Interest) evidenced intent to collude and conspire in acts of tampering and/or unduly coercing the jury ? evidence of a "tainted? jury.
* During fact-trying, prosecution based its case solely upon non-corroborated, unproven accusation of one accuser. Evidence presented (by prosecution) included:
1. Fabricated facts testified by informant as first witness (being incompetent, irrelevant to charge, inconsistent and contradictory and thus challenged by Petitioner?s motion to impeach on the record, and during cross-examination) (Black?s Law Dictionary 408 Abridged 6th edition 1991).
2. Electronic audio recording of dispatch call ? the initial accusation ? reported by said first witness (which included audible background of Petitioner, from a distance, orating about the false report while departing).
3. Second and last witness, Officer Guthrie of the Woodland Police Department testified that he did not witness incident at scene of complaint while further panel testimony only evidenced that Petitioner had departed scene of incident without Fighting.
* Yet, jury reached wrongful verdict of "guilty? and Petitioner was wrongfully convicted of violation of PC ss 415.
Furthermore, trial, to this date, is still incomplete. Court is delaying sentencing, hence judgement, egregiously inordinate. Jury decision and verdict on 06/24/2016 has been last trial decision thus far. Judge, on same date, continued sentencing phase until 06/30/2016. Therefore, under such "Extraordinary Circumstances? (specifically with respect to delayed sentencing and judgement in bad faith), Petitioner, on 06/28/2016, filed Motion to Vacate Judgement arguing following headed points: CASE IS STILL PENDING UPON INORDINATELY DELAYED DECISION ON (PETITIONER?S) PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE, and that? AIR TRIAL PREJUDICIALLY HARMED BY UNDUE INFLUENCE UPON JURY. (Please refer to Appendix ____.)
* On 06/30/2016, at continued sentencing hearing, Maguire (conspicuously) retaliated maliciously against my most recent motion and with malice and intent to preemptively obstruct Post-Trial and succeeding causes for civil actions. On the record, the hearing was completely one-sided ? Distributed. Petitioner appeared prepared to orate in support and in defense on issues relevant to sentencing by statute. He attempted to raise and then asserted to raise them. Maguire blatantly denied Due Process precluding right to speak. Continually, he interrupted attempts to assert right for hearing on matter. Furthermore, he reversed accused Petitioner overbearingly insisting he not "interrupt ? Maguire also forbade right to state objections during an Unconstitutional, ex-parte "presentation? by the District Attorney?s Office.
Court acted to unjustly Duress Petitioner to accept settlement offer for a nonstatutory, Unconstitutional alternate to sentencing. Judge opened with prosecution. A Christopher Bulkley, Deputy District Attorney appeared present ? not prosecutor on record in the case and during trial (Fritz Van Der Hoek). Bulkley gave impromptu prepared presentation endorsing (on record) a newly conceived "program? ? the "Diversionary Homeless Program ? Accordingly, Petitioner would be Coerced to concede to Admission of Guilt, progress through stages of a thought-control program, accept "incompetent to Stand Trial? status and controlled, free housing for indefinite period of time (when I am not even native to this state or county).
Since I rejected said offer stating it to be unconstitutional on the record, Maguire persisted to Maliciously Retaliate with Gross Abuse of Discretion. Bulkley reiterated intent to Maliciously Raise Doubt about Competence to Stand Trial. Maguire threatened (even Blackmailed) with Prejudice in Sentencing Phase ? an excessive maximum jail term. Upon wrongful conviction while refusing to hear Petitioner on issues at hand for which he came prepared) as alternative to offer ? an alternate to

violations constitutes Shocking Post Trial Due Process. He unilaterally revoked Right to Self-Represent during sentencing and appointed Public Defender for court-set in error. Court sets-then revocation to be ?? ON THIS CASE ONLY FOR SENTENCING ? (Please see Appendix _____) Judge verbally confirmed, per Petitioner's inquiry in open court, Petitioner otherwise remains Pro-Se in all cases. As reasoning, Maguire rationalized malicious prejudice against Petitioner's aggressive demeanor as behavior indicating mental incompetence. He argued oversangly. Petitioner's rejection of said counsel was believed by himself to be "Irrational ? Further more. Respondent refused to permit objections to Unconstitutional Acts of "forcing a lawyer" upon a defendant while fully aware of irreconcilable, Substantial Conflict with same counsel. Court continued rendering until 07/13/2016. Petitioner filed Faretta motion on 07/13/2016. (Please see Appendix ___)

Date for case 15-4705 concurrently with case 14-1219 has been set for 02/16/2017. Meanwhile, continued "hearing? date for case 13-3608 concurrently with 13-2885 has been set, separated from others, for 02/2/2017. Scheduling occurred as result of 2 separate false arrests upon 4 false bench warrants by Woodland Police Department on 11/02/16 and 1/21/2016.

Petitioner holds issued warrants constituted gross abuse of discretion and malicious Abuse of Legal Process on following grounds

1. Although absent in Respondent court on 08/24/2016, Petitioner was circumstantially unable to appear. He was occupied with procedure of serving Petition for Extraordinary Writ and while indigent, without adequate transportation and distant. 2. Petitioner requested stay of proceedings within Petition aforesaid. 3. Hearing date on 08/24/2016 was set for multiplicity of matters in all cases simultaneously being continued since 07/27/2016. Colluding public officials exploited anomalous "hearing" procedure to harass Petitioner with multiplication of warrants and arrests upon single hearing. Petitioner was, during this time, constantly active p[illegible] his sentencing and motion practice. Frivolous restraints disrupted his abilities to prepare and practice.

MAIN ISSUE

DEFENDANT ◆S RIGHT TO FAIR TRIAL PRE JUDICED BY PROTRACTED RESTRAINT OF HIS LIBERTY TO AN AREA

A total accumulation of four criminal matters have overbearingly initiated by the Yolo County District Attorney◆s Office. Meanwhile, procrastination [illegible] public officials in these matters to overbearing upon the Defendant a type of Prosecutorial Harassment that is Bordering on Arrest by unjustly depriving Defendant of liberty and, also, life in that his opportunities for employment are disrupted, associations (such as Church affiliations) are severed and impaired onto nonation (with violation ◆ deep seated ostracization) by protracted punitive, procedural siege in a foreign region. Concurrently, impoverished without domicile. Defendant must expend time-consuming effort toward life-sustaining activities while balancing deliberative, exhaustive labor of Criminal Defense (once again ◆ without income). Having, by necessity, to self-represent in such circumstances is depleting his resources, imposing impediments to conducive working conditions, retarding his ability to prepare for trial as a Fair Trial issue, inducing anxiety and inflicting distress reasonable to expect by reasonable person◆s standard.

Furthermore, Defendant is forced by necessity to self-represent (in all four cases) due to severely substantial conflict with counsel being in an unfair conflict with agents of the state. The pivotal case on the federal question concerning definition of standards for determining competence to self-represent, Indiana v. Edwards, generated contributory research and analysis of issue for application in the states. In The Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law ◆ Psychiatrists Morris and Freeman published a clinical study on choice to exercise Right to Self-Represent as a phenomena with analysis toward ◆professional guidelines related to forensic psychiatric practice◆ and ◆limitations of the decision◆◆ The Defendant found article annotated in either California Jurisprudence or American Jurisprudence or some similar secondary authority for research under the topic of Competence to Self-represent confronted with in Case numbered 13-0003628 and for his Faretta motion.

Amongst positive reasons for such choice, vindicated by these researchers, include, ◆◆ little trust in the fairness of the legal system◆ when it is reasonable to believe that Fiduciary interests of ◆public defenders◆ are compromised since ◆they are employees of the state◆ (Douglas m. Morris, MD, and Richard L. Freeman, MD, Pro Se Competence in the Aftermath of Indiana v. Edwards, 36 J Am Acad Psychiatry 561-567 (2008)). Obviously, such determinants would constitute an unfair conflict between a Defendant and Agents of the State necessitating self-representation for any adequate defense (especially if defendant is indigent). Defendant, well, and rationally by his experience, claims, evidence shows such a condition exists in this case pending (as well as others pending simultaneously) giving rise to a severely substantial conflict because of gross ineffective counsel by public defenders.

According to Serna, ◆Right to speedy trial protects criminal defendant against oppressive pretrial incarceration, anxiety, concern and disruption of his everyday life◆ (Serna v Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal 239). Furthermore, this Court reasoned, quoting from U.S. v Marion,

◆Inordinate delay between arrest, indictment and trial may impair a defendant◆s ability to present an effective defense. But the major evils protected against by the speedy trial guarantee exists quite apart from actual or possible prejudice to an accused◆s defense. To legally arrest and detain, the Government must assert probable cause to believe the arrestee has committed a crime. Arrest is a public act that may seriously interfere with a Defendant◆s liberty, whether he is free on bail or not, and that may disrupt his employment, drain his financial resources, curtail his associations, subject him to (reputation harm), and create anxiety in him, his family and friends◆◆ (U. S. v Marion (1971) 404 US 307 as quoted in Serna v Superior Court (1985) 40 Cal 239).

Proceeding on these actions would not serve justice, but only prejudice the Petitioner in that the delays are causing undue disruption to his life without justifiable cause. At time of arrest, he did not have outstanding warrants, nor a criminal record. Indigent, Petitioner is not resident to the area. He intends to move on and tend to important life matters, yet his liberty to move is restrained by violation of Speedy Trial Rights ◆ and without income ◆ in proceedings pending for total of over three and one-half years in Respondent Court. Finally, in lieu of above, Petitioner has already punitively suffered in excess of maximum sentences for all cases together in total by said restraints.

POINT IN SUPPORT OF JOINDERING CLAIMS FOR EXTRAORDINARY RELIEF

Petitioner◆s Fair Trial and Due Process Rights have been prejudiced prima facie in each case by anomalous procedures ordered throughout all pending cases together. All prosecutorial actions named herein (cases 13-3608, 1323885, 14-1219 and 15-6705) are connected together in same scheme effecting accumulated Overburden unfairly constituting Abuse of Legal Process via Retaliatory and Malicious Prosecutorial and Procedural Harassment. They all have been initiated against Petitioner upon complaints by Real Party in Interest alleging charges. As Gross Abuses of Discretion by Respondent Court, they prove Conspiracy to Commit Infractions against Petitioner◆s Fundamental Rights amongst Agents of the State in Yolo County colluding.

Pursuant to CA CCP ◆ 1100, petition for Extraordinary Writ initiates a form of civil action and rules of procedure prescribed in CCP ◆ 307, 1062.30 apply. Pursuant to CCP ◆ 427.10, a cross-complainant may join any causes of action he or she has against party making complaint against the same. The purpose of statutory provision for joinder ◆is to permit joinder in one action of several causes arising out of related transactions and involving common issues. The statute should be liberally construed so as to permit joinder whenever possible in furtherance of this purpose◆ (Mize v. Anderson (2012) 207 Cal. App. 4th 828).

For purposes of the Petition for Extraordinary Writ, Petitioner is same as cross-complainant by definition. He possesses these multiple civil causes of action for relief with merit against same party being Real Party in Interest named herein. Therefore, it is in the interest of justice that this court joinder said cases as causes together and issue its peremptory writ ordering Respondent to dismiss in all cases and terminate all prosecutorial actions aforesaid.

COURT PRE JUDICIALLY ERRED IN ORDERING WARRANT FOR ARREST CHARGING CONTEMPT OF COURT

At CSR on 08/24/2016, post gross denial of process during 1000 docket, presiding judge (Daniel Maguire) overcautiously ordered warrant for arrest charging unlawfully acts of misfeasance by Petitioner upon Prosecutor◆s request ex parte. Judge presumptively erred in granting order with motive to retaliate by act of vindictive Prosecution in a Conspiracy to Commit Constitutional violations.

On Wednesday 07/27/2016 at 1000, as Defendant self-representing, Petitioner arrived to appear for hearing upon motions at the Superior Court, Yolo County Department 10. As overburdening, arbitrary procedure, hearing was upon 3 separate matters in 2 separate cases. By mean, Petitioner was blatantly denied

hearing although present. Judge called break for lunch at end of calendared docket session. He then, as recurrence amongst 47 hearings frequented by such prejudicial treatment, rationalized that my cases involve too many issues and take too long. Meanwhile, matters for others were heard dramatically longer than typical for Petitioner at bench. Omission constituted flagrant Due Process denial and Procedural Harassment. Improper. It caused excessive disruption to my day. I had other matters to tend to and for survival being discriminatorily delayed in court.

During scheduled session, a bailiff of the Sheriff's Department vindictively belied to entrap with discriminatory action in open court. Petitioner entered line to approach bench. Bailiff initiated to remove me from the courtroom unreasonably and imprudently. Off the record, as session concluded, Petitioner urgently communicated (as he was being removed) asserting his right for hearing without inordinate prejudicial delay effected. Judge silently ignored, left bench for lunchbreak without acknowledging issue.

Petitioner returned 1440 during afternoon docket for addressal of issue. During interim, he had tended to personal necessary matters not able to arrive at exactly 0130 when, circumstantially, court procedurally defaulted previous. Also, it is customary for counsel to arrive enter line during course of session to be heard. Twice bailiff persisted enforcing that Petitioner remain outside courtroom and presented minute order recording, "People request a warrant based upon Defendant's contemptuousness in court." Petitioner requested callback. After Bailiff attempted further baiting with repeated, irrelevant, circular questioning and responses, he accommodated.

Judge called Petitioner to bench." Then informed on record that he refused to hear him on date. Specific Deputy District Attorney was now absent. Tough others were then present. Matters were not continued. Judge imposed one minute for requested statement on the record and cut it short.

Petitioner's spoken words were not "in themselves contemptuous," nor "uttered in an insolent or defiant manner." (Rose v Superior Court for Los Angeles County (1934) 140 Cal. App. 416). He acted within right, in context, addressing blatant denial of Due Process as Constitutional Fundamental. His act possessed justifiable showing of cause necessary toward aggressive defense addressing distressingly expedient issue, especially factoring extraordinary circumstances resulting from prolonged pattern of Abuse of Legal Process harassing petitioner in a harmful manner (as above). His statement failed to warrant "... taking disciplinary action against (Petitioner)," during ex parte proceeding subsequent with Prosecutor (Gallagher v Municipal Court of City of Los Angeles (1948) 31 Cal. 2d 784, in re Buckley (1973) 10 Cal. 3d 237).

Petitioner did not "persistently (interrupt)" court proceedings (as) an attorney" as to embarrass the administration of justice." (In re Hallmann (1962) 206 Cal. App. 121). Pro Se, he possessed "the duty to protect (his) interests (as Defendant)" and "press legitimate argument and to protest an erroneous ruling"" which was, by omission, act obstructing justice by Due Process (In re Hallmann, Supra).

Here, summary contempt power must not "stifle freedom of thought and speech so necessary to a fair trial under the adversary system." In re Hallmann, Supra). The court must not unduly interfere with representations." "Obligation to vigorously represent interests of a Defendant," "apparent disrespect was "objectively clear." But, "the subjective impression of the judge." (Degeorge v Superior Court (1974) 40 Cal. App. 3d 305).

Extraordinary Circumstance of Overburden in lieu of Abuses of Legal Process make it impractical for Petitioner to file timely several motions at issue (such as Change of Venue, Disqualify Judge and Prosecutor) not several Petitions for each case. Therefore, it would be in the interest of justice for Court to order stay on all proceedings in all cases against Petitioner per requests and in ponder of causes. Doctrine of laches (in fairness) rules at issue.

James E. Horton, In Propria Persona

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. HORTON IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA Rules Of Court " 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON-POSSESSION OF PROPER TRANSCRIPTS

I, James E. Horton, as Defendant in Propria Persona, declare under penalty of perjury, on information and belief, under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Whereas, on 06/22/2016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial readiness conference on 06/15/2016 with Court Reporter's Office at Respondent Court.

Whereas, on 06/23/2016, Petitioner filed request for transcript of trial beginning 06/28/16.

Whereas, on that date of 06/24/2016, obviously responsive to requests filed aforesaid, court reporter, Lisa Schafer, approached Petitioner present in courtroom communicating transcripts would not ever be provided to him. She claimed her "manager" informed her of policy accordingly, instructed her to inform petitioner of said policy based on grounds that a fee waiver was never ordered covering (when a fee waiver had been granted recorded in court file which Petitioner previously had received transcripts upon during pre trial and when such delivery is at cost of the state in criminal proceedings by statute and relevant Judicial Council rules).

Whereas, on 06/24/2016, petitioner filed application for fee waiver specifically for transcripts and Respondent filed order denying request on either 06/25/16 or 06/27/2016 reasoning, "Judgement has not issued and no appeal is pending. Request may be re-submitted after entry of judgment." Judge dated order signed as "June 25, 2016." Case Summary Report reflects "Order denying Fee Waiver" dated 06/27/2016.

Whereas, on 06/27/2016, Petitioner filed request for hearing about court fee waiver order, court set order to appeal order for 07/27/2016 which was continued since Petitioner said denied procedure on said date.

Whereas on 07/01/2016, Petitioner filed application for waiver specifying request for transcripts to attach to Petitions "despite for appeal" other proper motions for extraordinary relief""

Whereas, court has procedurally defaulted on ignoring Petitioner's application filed 07/01/2016.

Whereas, Petitioner filed Request to Waive Additional Court Fees on 07/15/2016 specifying transcripts were needed for Petitions and for Faretta motion, not appeal.

Whereas, on 07/18/2016, judge, delaying request filed 07/15/2016, ordered another fee waiver hearing date for 08/24/2016 being same date set for continued sentencing, warrant review hearing upon Faretta motion and multitude of other matters for all cases simultaneously as Procedural Harassment and Abuse of Legal Process.

Thereby, despite Petitioner's full faith and diligence to acquire proper transcripts, Respondent Court has denied delivery and they are unavailable for attachment. MOTION TO DISQUALIFY JUDGES

Petitioner, James E. Horton, Pro se, in forma pauperis, now comes attending as follows:

Numerous contingencies of cases at issue to petition attached show prima facie, that public officials at the Superior Court of the State of California, County of Los Angeles, respondent, possesses malice intent toward him and are hostile to his Fundamental Rights. They are clearly incapable of being impartial.

Respondent is harming said Petitioner's ability to prepare defense with unjust overburden by accumulative prosecutorial harassment, speedy trial and due process denials and infractions disrupting his life. Therefore, he lacks time for further research at issue for this motion.

Wherefore, Petitioner hereby motions this court, however to issue its decision, mandate or order, upon whatever merits by applicable law are obvious prima facie, to disqualify all judges of said respondent court from hearing matters and adjudicating further in Petitioner's cases immediately with stay. Even if precedential, granting this motion serves the interest of justice when weighing presumptive issues.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF

THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA James E. Horton Case No.: DSM25 MOTION TO COMPEL RECORD AND TRANSCRIPTS NEEDED FOR REVIEW

Despite Petitioner's full faith and diligence to acquire adequate record, Respondent Court has denied delivery and it is unavailable for attachment. (Please refer to Declaration" IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT " 8.486(3) IN LIEU OF NON-POSSESSION OF PROPER TRANSCRIPTS attached on pg. 23 of Appendix A.) Petitioner has conveyed, to Appellate Court, intent to "compel documents from lower court and Real Party in Interest" subsequent to and upon

6

filing of his petition. (Please refer to DECLARATION◆ IN SUPPORT PURSUANT TO CA RULES OF COURT ◆ 8.486(B)(2) IN LIEU OF NON-POSSESSION OF FILE STAMPED HARD COPIES TO APPENDIX attached as pg. 22 of Appendix A.) Respondent Court immediately Summarily Denied improperly without allowing for the above. Transcripts and case-file record are necessary pursuant to CA Rules of Court ◆ 8.486.

Furthermore, Petitioner avers experiencing deprival of mail delivery by post offices in Yolo County consistent with much evidencing collusion amongst public officials to commit retaliatory misconduct and out of court. Although not able to substantiate evidentiary here now, Petitioner pleads this court to justly factor assertion, its possibility, regarding a conspiracy to commit various harmful violations causing Petitioner, indigent, to be destitute of a reliable, physical mailing address. (Recently prior to respondent judge McGuire's acquisition of position at the bench, he served as non-judge in executive cabinet of Governor Schwarzenegger at the capitol of the state of California and possesses connectivities to misappropriate toward such an asserted design.) Therefore, he demands delivery by attachment and transmission, and void of any further procedural requirement (statutory or otherwise) upon Petitioner (as they would obstructive to his presumptive rights at issue) serviced to his email address herein provided which he is able to access even under Extraordinary Circumstances imposed as averred. He desperately needs copies for his records for defense. Wherefore, even if precedential in the interest of justice procedurally, Petitioner hereby moves this court for an order compelling respondent to deliver transcripts and case-file records. . [Concluded]

Relevant Diary Records

CANTONITES WHO HAVE CONFLICTED WITH ME

Atty. Frank Fanchione. Unhelpful with my valid complaints with Marie as prosecutor. [Currently judge of Common Pleas]

Atty. Christine Johnson. Convicted of fraud after acting as G.A.L.

Law Director Joseph Markusic. Externship at Law Dept. He said "If you tell what goes on here, your dead. just kidding" during my interview. I assumed it was kidding.

Atty. George Urban. My law teacher at Brown Mackie. He told to me to put my Bible away in class. He got in my face and yelled about Adam and Eve's free-will. I was Indiana.

Vice Squad. When I reported about Marie.

Ex-management of American Festival Workers (the Walkers and Larry Martin). After my stay in late 2004, they were raided for corruption. I spoke of my experiences.

Atty. Morello. He represented Marie.

Marie Brinley. Assaults at the house and evidence from P.I.

Various people I have met at the YM.C.A. since I moved in 1999. I did not run in the same flood of dissipation with drugs and prostitutes and so on. Many became hostile for this. I did not condone their ways although I treated them with dignity as human beings. They resented it. (Where do they get the drugs from?)

CANTON CHILDREN SERVICES. Per Marie's report, they claimed that I "gave them so much attitude that they had to get the 'manager'". I see the incident differently. I feel I was treated with incredulity and discrimination as a non-custodial father. I was only persistent about my concerns. The predominantly female staff were consistently attitudinal and derogatory. I felt disrespected as a concerned parent.

CANTONITES WHO KNOW ME

Judge Michael Howard. I was active as my own attorney during my Domestic cases. I attracted a lot of attention with my innocent activities at Family Court.

During my externship at the Law Dept.

Atty. Jason Reese. I did work for him dealing with landlords. He acknowledges me on the street.

Atty. Kathleen O. Tatarsky. I drafted memorandum for her and organized her files.

Judge John Pavlos. I observed court room procedure under him during my externship. He acknowledges me on the street.

Create CtlgCdpndncyRgstr =
/FBICmplnts

-> Flng

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

On [illegible], I requested portions of the attached information via the FBI's online tip form. I selected "Other" for reason. Limitations of content precluded report as thoroughly intended. Therefore, I am hereby corresponding to request full report in letter by mail.

9

Sincerely,

[illegible]

U.S. Postal Service
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT

7019 2280 0002 0127 9285

U.S. Postal Service™
CERTIFIED MAIL® RECEIPT
Domestic Mail Only

For delivery information, visit our website at www.usps.com®.

OFFICIAL USE

Certified Mail Fee
$

Extra Services & Fees (check box, add fee as appropriate)
- ☐ Return Receipt (hardcopy) $
- ☐ Return Receipt (electronic) $
- ☐ Certified Mail Restricted Delivery $
- ☐ Adult Signature Required $
- ☐ Adult Signature Restricted Delivery $

Postage
$

Total Postage and Fees
$

Sent To

Street and Apt. No.; or PO Box No.

City, State, ZIP+4

CPU SACRAMENTO CA
FEB 12 2020
95835-4217

17

Post Office Address:
Raleys
4650 Natomas Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95835

The UPS Store - #4348
2121 NATOMAS CROSSING
SUITE # 200
SACRAMENTO, CA 95834
(916) 419-6267

03/05/20 12:19 PM

We are the one stop for all your shipping, postal and business needs.

We also print banners and posters for all occasions

001 000012 (009) T2 $ 2.59
wat'ls standard pack
002 001040 (001) T0 $ 17.56
Ground Commercial
Tracking# 1Z6A1Y684204575210

SubTotal	$	20.15
Taxable (T2)	$	0.23
Total	$	20.38
Cash	$	20.38

Receipt ID 6309068817505188823 2 Items
CSH: Diego Tran: 9496 Reg: 001

USPS Postal does not have a guarantee

Whatever your business and personal needs, we are here to serve you.

We're here to help.
Join our FREE email program to receive great offers and resources.

www.theupsstore.com/signup

d Conditions

THE UPS STORE #4348

...ie ...vided	DESCRIPTION OF GOODS DOCUMENTS

...ENT ...ERAL BRUEAU OF INVESTIGATION ...R. CLEVELAND FIELD OFFICE ... LAKESIDE AVE E ...VELAND, OH 44114-1138	PKG	TRACKING NUMBER	DECL. VAL.
	1	1Z6A1Y684204575210	N/A

...ice", or "Our") will receive, forward and/or pack parcels for you (the customer ("You" or "Your"). The carrier for Your parcel(s) accepted by Us is ...ssigned by Us. You represent Your true name and address appear as under above.

...DMD. Illegal items or articles of unusual value, including but not limited to cash. In addition, the Carrier's tariff, service guide, or terms and ...ed items. Certified locations may accept some forms of OHMD. Parcels containing "Food" (as defined in section 201 (f) of the Federal Food, Drug ... applicable terms and conditions in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions in effect on the date of shipment.

...subject to the UPS Tariff Terms and Conditions of Service ("UPS Terms") in effect on the date of shipment, which are available at ...ers' rights, responsibilities, and limitations of liability with respect to the transportation of Your parcel(s) and are hereby incorporated in full into ... **BATION CLAUSE AND CLASS ACTION WAIVER, which apply to any controversy or claim, whether at law or equity, arising out of or ...d of such dispute, except for claims that may be filed in courts of limited jurisdiction such as small claims, justice of the peace, magistrate ...e civil disputes.**

...or. We are not the Carrier's agent. You agree that We will be deemed the shipper of Your parcel(s) with the Carrier and that You are not the shipper ...only against the Carrier. Any rights You may have to receive damages or other compensation with respect to the transportation of Your parcel(s) ...ted to those rights described in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions or in the PSO. You agree that We, as the shipper of Your parcel(s), are solely ...ble for transporting Your parcel(s).

...ces of Your parcel(s) or for loss or damage to any cause to the parcel(s) or their contents that occurs after We render Your parcel(s) to the Carrier ...may request a signature on delivery and pay any applicable charge. You agree that the Carrier is not liable for loss or damage occurring after delivery ...cluding all terms and conditions related to Your participation in the optional Declared Value Program.

...livery is only an estimate, and is not guaranteed in any manner. **We are not liable for any consequential, indirect, special, incidental or punitive ...ages.** Our responsibility for damage or loss caused by improper packing by Us is limited to any applicable Declared Value Program or other ...ge.

...ility for loss or damage to Your parcel(s) is strictly limited to the amounts set forth in this PSO and the Carrier's Terms and Conditions for the ...ility for loss or damage. Liability for loss or damage is limited to Your actual damages or $100 per parcel, whichever is less, unless You declare a ...ter the Declared Value Programs. We and the Carrier are not liable or responsible for items of unusual value, precious metals, negotiable ...ities is excluded, under the Carrier's Terms and Conditions. Additional terms and conditions governing loss or damage claims can be found in the ...

...declared value limits for loss or damage, subject to terms and conditions (including monetary limits) ("**Declared Value Program**"). The declared ...conditions of the applicable Declared Value Program. We exchange the cost of the product. If You elect to participate in the Declared Value ... eligible parcel(s) through the Carrier. You expressly acknowledge that the value of each parcel does not exceed the amount You declared as the ...of each parcel does not exceed $100. If You do not declare a value above $100 and pay an additional charge for a parcel containing items of greater ...ue damage in the items in that parcel. The Carrier's terms and conditions, including monetary limits, for its Declared Value Program are located on ...

...damage to Your parcel(s) under the Declared Value Program, You agree to make the claim through Us. If You make such claim through Us, We ...cover to You any recovery on the claim paid to Us by the Carrier for Your parcel(s). You expressly agree that We have no liability of any claim or ...on You make a Guaranteed Service Refund (GSR) request to UPS. You agree to provide to UPS your bank authorize Us to provide to UPS Your ...

...under any Declared Value Program must be in writing and received by Us within the Carrier's required time frame as set forth in the Carrier's Terms ...ed and will not be paid. For all damage claims, the original packaging materials must be made available for the Carrier's inspection prior to ...g documents, including but not limited to the PSO and a copy of the shipment receipt, and proof of the value of the lost or damaged items for any ...

...Carrier for Your parcel(s). If You believe any parcel is eligible for a refund under the UPS Service Guarantee as set forth in the UPS Terms, You ...days of the date of scheduled delivery. If You do not contact Us within the prescribed time frame, any claim to a refund under the UPS Service ...

...ing, and solely responsible for all aspects of Our operations. We are the exclusive employer of all employees of Our business. You acknowledge and ...and is not the employee or joint employee of the employees of Our business. This PSO constitutes the entire agreement between You and Us and ...dings, and representations, written or oral, relating to the subject matter hereof.

...ion is accurate for each parcel (a) You confirm the Declared Value for each parcel, if any, or service (b) You have read and understand the terms and ...all such terms and conditions, and (c) by so signing, this PSO constitutes binding and enforceable obligations of You. YOU ACKNOWLEDGE ...UPS Terms, any claims against Us or UPS (including its affiliates) arising out of or relating to provision of service by UPS are subject to individual ...

Thu 5 Mar 2020

TRANSACTION DATE

19

THE UPS STORE #4348

Parcel Shipping Order (PSO) Terms and Conditions

SHIP DATE	SHIPMENT INFORMATION	DESCRIPTION OF GOODS
Thu 05 Mar 2020	UPS Ground Com 1 package Total Declared Value: Not provided	DOCUMENTS

SENDER	RECIPIENT	PKG	TRACKING NUMBER	DECL VAL
JAMES HORTON 2121 NATOMAS CROSSING DR Sacramento, CA 95834 Tel: (916) 562-5584	FEDERAL BRUEAU OF INVESTIGATION ATTN: CLEVELAND FIELD OFFICE 1501 LAKESIDE AVE E CLEVELAND, OH 44114-1138	1	1Z8A1Y684204575210	N/A

Subject to these terms and conditions, this The UPS Store® center ("We", "Us", or "Our") will receive, forward and/or pack parcels for you the customer ("You" or "Your"). The carrier for Your parcel(s) accepted by Us ("Carrier") will be UPS®. The Carrier may refuse to ship Your parcel(s) accepted by Us. You represent Your true name and address appear as under above.

We do not accept hazardous material, Other Regulated Material (Class 9 DOT), illegal items or articles of unusual value, including but not limited to cash. In addition, the Carrier's tariff, service guide, or terms and conditions ("Carrier's Terms and Conditions") may specify other restricted items. Certified vacation may accept some forms of DRUGS. Parcels containing "Bread" (as defined in section 201 (f) of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act), will be accepted for transportation only according to the applicable terms and conditions in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions in effect on the date of shipment.

We do not transport Your parcel(s). The Carrier transports Your parcel(s) subject to the UPS Tariff Terms and Conditions of Service ("UPS Terms") in effect on the date of shipment, which are available at www.ups.com. The Carrier's Terms and Conditions set forth the Carrier's rights, responsibilities, and limitations of liability with respect to the transportation of Your parcel(s) and are hereby incorporated in full into this PSO. **The UPS Terms contain a MANDATORY BINDING ARBITRATION CLAUSE AND CLASS ACTION WAIVER, which apply to any controversy or claim, whether at law or equity, arising out of or relating to provision of services by UPS, regardless of the date of accrual of such dispute, except for claims that may be filed in courts of limited jurisdiction such as small claims, justice of the peace, magistrate court, and similar courts with monetary limits on their jurisdictions over civil disputes.**

We are Your agent for receiving and forwarding Your parcel(s) to the Carrier. We are not the Carrier's agent. You agree that We will be deemed the shipper of Your parcel(s) with the Carrier and that You are not the shipper under the Carrier's Terms and Conditions. You therefore have no rights directly against the Carrier. Any rights You may have to recover damages or other compensation with respect to the transportation of Your parcel(s) (including for loss, damage, or the Carrier's failure to timely deliver) are limited to those rights described in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions or in this PSO. You agree that We, as the shipper of Your parcel(s), are solely entitled to any discounts or adjustments to the charges that We pay the Carrier for transporting Your parcel(s).

Except as expressly set forth in this PSO, We assume no liability for the delivery of Your parcel(s) or for loss or damage to any cause to the parcel(s) or their contents that occurs after We tender Your parcel(s) to the Carrier. The Carrier's driver may deliver Your parcel(s) without a signature unless You request a signature on delivery and pay any applicable charge. You agree that the Carrier is not liable for loss or damage occurring after delivery of Your parcel(s). You also agree to all terms and conditions in this PSO, including all terms and conditions related to Your participation in the optional Declared Value Program.

Any statement by Us regarding a probable date and (if applicable) time of delivery is only an estimate, and is not warranted in any manner. **We are not liable for any consequential, indirect, special, incidental or punitive damages, or any loss or damage resulting from delays in shipping or delivery.** Our responsibility for damage to items caused by improper packing by Us is limited to any applicable Declared Value Program or other program that We may offer and for which You have paid any applicable charge.

Limitations of Liability and Exceptions. Our liability and the Carrier's liability for loss or damage to Your parcel(s) is strictly limited to the amounts set forth in this PSO and the Carrier's Terms and Conditions (in the event of conflict, the Carrier's Terms and Conditions govern the Carrier's liability for loss or damage). Liability for loss or damage is limited to Your actual damages or $100 per parcel, whichever is less, unless You declare a higher value and pay the applicable charge for a higher authorized value under the Declared Value Program. We and the Carrier are not liable or responsible for items of unusual value, precious metals, negotiable instruments, or items prohibited from shipment, or for which the Carrier's liability is excluded, under the Carrier's Terms and Conditions. Additional terms and conditions governing loss or damage claims can be found in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions.

Declared Value Program. UPS offers a declared value program providing declared value limits for loss or damage, subject to terms and conditions (including monetary limits) ("**Declared Value Program**"). The declared value product will be available only if You have complied with all terms and conditions of the applicable Declared Value Program. We exchange the cost of this product. If You elect to participate in the Declared Value Program and You pay any applicable charge, We will declare value for Your eligible parcel(s) through the Carrier. You expressly acknowledge that the value of each parcel does not exceed the amount You declared as the "Declared Value". If You do not declare a Value, You agree that the value of each parcel does not exceed $100. If You do not declare a value above $100 and pay an additional charge for a parcel containing items of greater value than $100, You will not be entitled to recover more than $100 for loss or damage to the items in that parcel. The Carrier's terms and conditions, including monetary limits, for its Declared Value Program are located at the Carrier's Terms and Conditions.

Claims Filed Through Us. If You or the consignee has a claim for loss or damage to Your parcel(s) under the Declared Value Program, You agree to make the claim through Us. If You make such claim through Us, We will submit a claim to the Carrier as the shipper of the parcels, and We will remit to You any recovery on the claim paid to Us by the Carrier for Your parcel(s). You expressly agree that We have no liability if any claim is denied or paid only in part by the Carrier or other declared value. In the event You make a Guaranteed Service Refund (GSR) request to UPS, You agree to provide to UPS (and hereby authorize Us to provide to UPS) Your name and address to be used by UPS to process the request.

Filing a Claim under the Declared Value Program. Any and all claims under any Declared Value Program must be in writing and received by Us within the Carrier's required time frame as set forth in the Carrier's Terms and Conditions. Claims not made within the prescribed time frame are waived and will not be paid. For all damage claims, the original packaging materials must be made available for the Carrier's inspection prior to redispatch. All claims for loss or damage must be supported by the shipping documents, including but not limited to this PSO and a copy of the shipment receipt, and proof of the value of the lost or damaged items for any declaration of value over $100.

Filing a UPS Guaranteed Service Refund (GSR) request. If UPS is the Carrier for Your parcel(s), if You believe any parcel is eligible for a refund under the UPS Service Guarantee as set forth in the UPS Terms, You must contact Us at the location that shipped the parcel(s) within 11 calendar days of the date of scheduled delivery. If You do not contact Us within the prescribed time frame, any claim to a refund under the UPS Service Guarantee is waived and will not be paid.

We are an independently owned and operated franchise of The UPS Store, Inc. and solely responsible for all aspects of Our operations. We are the exclusive employer of all employees of Our business. You acknowledge and agree that The UPS Store, Inc. is not liable for any of Our acts or omissions and is not the employer or joint employer of the employees of Our business. This PSO constitutes the entire agreement between You and Us, and supersedes all prior, subsequent and contemporaneous agreements, understandings, and representations, written or oral, relating to the subject matter hereof.

By signing below, You acknowledge that (i) You confirm the Ship to Address is accurate for each parcel; (ii) You confirm the Declared Value for each parcel, if any, is correct; (iii) You have read and reviewed the terms and conditions described above in their entirety; (iv) You agree to be bound by all such terms and conditions; and (v) by so signing, this PSO constitutes binding and enforceable obligations of You. YOU FURTHER ACKNOWLEDGE AND AGREE that, except as expressly set forth in the UPS Terms, any claim against Us or UPS (including its affiliates) arising out of or relating to provision of service by UPS are subject to mandatory binding arbitration, as set forth in the UPS Terms available at www.ups.com/terms.

21

X James Horton

CUSTOMER SIGNATURE

Thu 5 Mar 2020

TRANSACTION